

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/139,425

08/25/98

ESMON

C

OMRF-171

HM12/1004

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP
ONE ATLANTIC CENTER
1201 W. PEACHTREE STREET
SUITE 2000
ATLANTA GA 30309-3400

EXAMINER

SANDALS, W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1636

DATE MAILED:

10/04/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/139,425

Applicant(s)
Esmon et al.

Examiner
William Sandals

Art Unit
1636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 16, 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7, 12, 13, and 15-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8-11, 14, and 21-25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1636

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Arguments and amendments submitted in Paper No. 18, filed July 16, 2001 regarding the rejection of claims 5-7, 12 and 16-19 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph have been considered but are not found convincing and the rejection is sustained and repeated below.
2. Arguments and amendments submitted in Paper No. 18 regarding the rejection of claims 7 and 19 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph have been considered but are not found convincing and the rejection is sustained and repeated below.
3. Arguments and amendments submitted in Paper No. 18 regarding the rejection of claims 13, 15, 19 and 20 under 35 USC 102 have been considered but are not found convincing and the rejection is sustained and repeated below.
4. Amendments to claims 5 and 16 in Paper No. 18 have overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph in the previous office action, and the rejection is withdrawn.
5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any

Art Unit: 1636

person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 5-6, 12 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The claims are drawn to a method of selectively delivering genes to a large vessel endothelial cell nucleus by binding a conjugate to an endothelial protein C receptor (EPCR). While applicants have shown the binding of a conjugate to an endothelial protein C receptor (EPCR) *in vitro*, they have not demonstrated any *in vivo* delivering of a gene to an endothelial cell, which constitutes a method of gene therapy. In order to do so, undue experimentation is required. Whether undue experimentation is needed is not based on a single factor, but rather a conclusion reached by weighing many factors. Many of these factors have been summarized in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The Wands factors as they apply to the instant claimed invention are as follows:

- a- The quantity of experimentation necessary to reduce the instant claimed invention to practice would involve delivering a gene to an endothelial cell for gene therapy.
- b- Only prophetic guidance and no examples of delivering a gene to an endothelial cell *in vivo* have been provided.

Art Unit: 1636

- c- The nature of the invention is complex. Gene therapy is a new and developing art as recited in Marshall in the section titled "The trouble with vectors", and at page 1054, column 3, and at page 1055, column 3. The problems of gene delivery, gene targeting to reach the intended host cell, and then to reach the intracellular target are not yet solved, as taught in Verma et al. (see especially page 239, column 3, the box titled "What makes an ideal vector?" and page 242).
- d- The prior art taught by Orkin et al. (see especially the section on "Gene transfer and expression" and "Gene therapy in man status of the field") described many problems in the developing field of gene therapy. Recited problems include: lack of efficacy, adverse short term effects and limited clinical experience, the inability to extrapolate experimental results and unreliability of animal models. Problems with the vector include: host immune response to the vector and the expressed product, difficulty of targeting the vector to the desired site, transient expression of the gene of interest and low efficiency of delivery of the vector to the targeted site.
- e- The state of the art as taught by Verma et al., which states "the problems - such as the lack of efficient delivery systems, lack of sustained expression, and host immune reactions - remain formidable problems" and Anderson, W. F. (see page 25, top of column 1), which states "[e]xcept for anecdotal reports of individual patients being helped, there is still no conclusive evidence that a gene-therapy protocol has been successful in the treatment of human disease".
- f- Therefore, given the analysis above, it must be considered that the skilled artisan would have needed to have practiced considerable non-routine, trial and error experimentation to enable the full scope of the claims.

Art Unit: 1636

Response to Arguments

8. Applicants have argued in Paper No. 5, that the argument above pertains to viral vectors. In as much as the references discuss viral vectors, those sections which are specific to the use of viral vectors for delivery of a nucleic acid to a cell clearly do not apply to the instant claimed invention. However, the bulk of the content of the references discusses the application of gene therapy, which does apply.

The statement in Anderson, WF, makes it clear that the state of the art in gene therapy, or delivery of nucleic acids for therapeutic purposes, is still a poorly understood art, and the references provided by applicant, while encouraging, do not overcome the problems facing practitioners in the gene therapy art, and make it clear that applicants must provide detailed teachings on how to make and use such an invention. Since these teachings are not presented in the instant claims and specification, the instant claimed invention is not enabled.

9. Paper No. 10 asserts that the amendments to the claims avoid the rejection. This is not the case, since the rejection is centered on the use of nucleic acids in a therapeutic method, for "gene therapy". The claims and specification are not enabled for gene therapy, as set forth in the rejection above.

10. Paper No. 10 asserts that claims 7 and 19 have been rejected in error, since they are claiming "drugs and diagnostic agents". The term of the claims, "drugs" is not defined, and as such, embraces the use of nucleic acids as "drugs", which are not enabled (see above).

Art Unit: 1636

11. Paper No. 13 asserts that the claims have been amended to read on *in vitro*. This is not convincing since the provision for *in vitro* does not exclude the *in vivo* limitations of the claims.

12. Paper No. 13 asserts that literature articles produced in reference to the practice of gene delivery are enabling for the instant claims. Two of the references are after the instant filing date by a year, and are not permitted as evidence of enablement. The remaining reference teaches the ability to physically deliver nucleic acids to a cell *in vivo*. The physical delivery of a nucleic acid to a cell *in vivo* is not a limitation which applies to the rejection of the claims above and is therefore a moot point. Anderson, W.F. is contemporary with the instant filing date, and Anderson, W. F. makes it abundantly clear that the process of gene therapy is still an undeveloped and unpredictable art. The burden of proof of enablement on the teachings of the instant specification is high. Since the instant claimed invention has only one *in vivo* utility, namely, gene therapy, the referenced articles do not overcome the instant enablement rejection of gene therapy as set forth in the instant specification.

13. Arguments set forth in Paper No. 18 assert that the references submitted in Paper No. 13 require formal consideration. One reference which had a publication date before the date of filing of the instant application was addressed above. The same argument applies to all three submitted references. None of the three articles submitted pertains to the instant claimed method or conjugate. The references are merely reports on limited successes in attempts to deliver nucleic acids to a cell *in vivo*. The rejection is based on lack of enablement for gene therapy. As such the argument does not apply.

Art Unit: 1636

14. Arguments are set forth in Paper No. 18 that no support for the argument of unpredictability has been presented. In the rejection above, the references cited demonstrate that at the time of filing the instant application, gene therapy was a poorly understood art. This being the case, there is a high burden upon the applicant to provide teachings which are fully enabling. A reliance upon the teachings of those of skill in the art is insufficient to overcome this rejection.

15. Paper 18 presents an amendment to the claims which now reads "or by catheterization". This limitation has been interpreted as meaning that the method is to be practiced *in vivo*. This being the case, the claims still read on *in vivo* gene therapy, and as such are not enabled.

16. Claims 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The amendment to the claims in Paper No. 13 has entered the language "non-nucleic acid drugs". The specification does not provide a description of this term, and the term is not art defined. As such the term "non-nucleic acid drugs" constitutes new matter.

Response to Arguments

17. Arguments set forth in Paper No. 18 assert that the language "non-nucleic acid drugs" finds implicit support in the instant specification at page 2, lines 10-13. The term "non-nucleic acid drugs" is not well defined by the passage cited. However, alternative language has been

Art Unit: 1636

suggested in Paper No. 18 which is more closely aligned with the sense of the passage at page 2. Amendment of the claims to read "drugs other than nucleic acids and proteins" would be acceptable.

18. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

19. Claims 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

20. Claims 7 and 19 have been amended to recite "non-nucleic acid drugs". No definition is provided in the instant claims and specification for the term. "Non-nucleic acid drugs" is not an art defined term. Since the term merely excludes nucleic acids but does not provide the metes and bounds of the term "non-nucleic acid drugs", it is vague and indefinite.

Response to Arguments

21. The term "non-nucleic acid drugs" has been discussed above in the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 1636

22. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

23. Claims 13, 15, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat No. 5,254,532.

US Pat No. 5,254,532 taught (see column 2, lines 17-23, example 10 and claim 3) a simultaneous binding of activated protein C and protein S to an endothelial cell of a large vessel. Protein S is inherently bound to activated protein C on the endothelial protein C receptor on large vessel endothelial cells. The proteins therefore are "conjugated" when bound to the endothelial protein C receptor on large vessel endothelial cells. This inherency is shown in US Pat No. 5,852,171 at column 7, lines 43-55.

Response to Arguments

24. Amendments to claim 13 have been made in an attempt to overcome the instant rejection above. The amendment is not deemed persuasive because a protein binding to a protein is a "conjugate", and within the broad interpretation of the meaning of the claim, this is a "chemical conjugate". Also, depending upon the pH conditions of a solution containing the above protein-protein conjugate, the conjugate may be a positively charged polymer.

Art Unit: 1636

Allowable Subject Matter

25. Claims 1-4 are allowed.
26. Claims 8-11 and 21-25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

27. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Certain papers related to this application are *welcomed* to be submitted to Art Unit 1636 by facsimile transmission. The FAX numbers are (703) 308-4242 and 305-3014. The faxing of

Art Unit: 1636

such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 CFR 1.6(d)). NOTE: If applicant *does* submit a paper by FAX, the original copy should be retained by the applicant or applicant's representative, and the FAX receipt from your FAX machine is proof of delivery. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED, so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to Dr. William Sandals whose telephone number is (703) 305-1982. The examiner normally can be reached Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM, EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's acting supervisor, Robert Schwartzman can be reached at (703) 308-7307.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Zeta Adams, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3291.

William Sandals, Ph.D.

Examiner

October 2, 2001


TERRY MCKELVEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER